

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 23, 24, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as allegedly being “anticipated” by Robotham et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0015042). While not acquiescing in this rejection or in the characterizations of Robotham et al. in the office action, the independent claims have been amended to specify that the display screen has a prescribed size and that the display screen resolution information is based on dot size, which corresponds to a number of dots forming a display image relative to outer dimensions of the display screen.

With reference to paragraphs [0397] to [0400] and Figures 9 and 10 of the published version of the subject patent application, the disclosed example systems and methods allow the display size of symbol images to be suitable for a particular display screen. The symbol images (e.g., map images or icons) are selected from an image data memory according to resolution related information based on dot size (which corresponds to the number of dots relative to the outer dimensions of the display screen) of the terminal to which the symbol images are transmitted. For example, based on the resolution related information, the server may select either a low, medium or high resolution symbol image from the image data memory as described with reference to Figures 9 and 10.

In contrast to the claimed systems and methods, Robotham et al. discloses a remote browser system using server-side rendering in which visual content is rendered onto a proxy display surface at the server and thereafter sent to a client for painting onto the client-side display. Robotham et al. does not describe discriminating symbol image data sent to a client

(e.g., by selecting a low, medium or high resolution symbol image from an image data memory) as set forth in the independent claims. Consequently, these independent claims and the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Robotham et al.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made “obvious” by a proposed combination of Robotham et al. and Pechatnikov et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that Pechatnikov et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Robotham et al. with respect to claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. For at least this reason, claim 4 patentably distinguishes from the proposed combination of Robotham et al. and Pechatnikov et al.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made “obvious” by a proposed combination of Robotham et al. and Kurumisawa et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0080516). Applicant respectfully submits that Kurumisawa et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Robotham et al. with respect to claim 24, from which claim 25 depends. Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 25 patentably distinguishes from the proposed combination of Robotham et al. and Kurumisawa et al.

KIKUCHI ET AL.
Appl. No. 10/576,871
Response to Office Action dated July 7, 2009

The pending claims are believed to be allowable over the applied reference and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Michael J. Shea/
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100